

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 10/679,820 | 10/06/2003 | Cyrus B. Meher-Homji | 51005/RDS/M60. | 3403 | |
| : | 7590 11/15/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| William W Haefliger | | | VERDIER, CHRISTOPHER M | | |
| 201 So Lake A Suite 512 | AVE | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Pasadena, CA 91101 | | | 3745 | | |
| | | | DATE MAIL ED: 11/15/200 | DATE MAIL ED: 11/15/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Before | the Filing of an Appeal Brief | | | | | |

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--|
| 10/679,820 | MEHER-HOMJI ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Christopher Verdier | 3745 | |

| | Official Volume | 0140 | |
|---|--|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with t | he correspondence add | lress |
| THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | APPLICATION IN CONDITION | FOR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | ving replies: (1) an amendment tice of Appeal (with appeal fee be with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl | , affidavit, or other evider in compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date | • | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a) | ater than SIX MONTHS from the m (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN | ailing date of the final rejecti | ion. |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 | ** | 7 4 426(a) and the annual | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amoshortened statutory period for reply than three months after the mailin | ount of the fee. The appropr originally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 mus | t be filed within two mont | hs of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e) |), to avoid dismissal of th | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a h | rief, will not be entered b | ecause |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see | | 00000 |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | y reducing or simplifying | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finall | rejected claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | · - | , , | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | n-Compliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | • | , |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 7 would be allowal allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendment ca | anceling the non- |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- | | will be entered and an | explanation of |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 4,6,8,10-12,14-20,22-27,29,30,35 and | <u>37-39</u> . | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>5</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>3,7,28 and 31-34</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under a | ppeal and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims aft | er entry is below or attac | hed. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | t does NOT place the applicati | on in condition for allowa | nce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet. | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | - chi W | |
| | | | |
| | | Christopher Verdie Primary Examiner | 3 1 |

Art Unit: 3745

Application No. 10/679,820

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 3 raises new issues that would require further consideration and does not simplify the issues for appeal, because the amendment to lines 8-9 and 13-15 of claim 3 includes a double recitation of the strip. Please note that this is mentioned in the previous Advisory Action of September 28, 2006.

Continuation of 13. Other: The Replacement Sheet of Drawings (figure 2) and the amendments to the specification, both filed October 20, 2006, would be entered if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claims.